DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 396 446 EA 027 692

AUTHOR Denig, Stephen J.
TITLE Discipline in Public and Religious Elementary and Secondary Schools: A Comparative Analysis.
PUB DATE Apr 96
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, April 8-12, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Discipline; Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Humanistic Education; Parochial Schools; Private Education; *Private Schools; *Public Schools; *Social Control; *Teacher Influence; *Teacher Student Relationship

ABSTRACT

Previous studies using the Pupil-Control Ideology Scale (PCI) have found that in general, secondary school teachers have a more custodial attitude toward pupil control than do primary school teachers, and that public school teachers have a more custodial attitude than do religious school teachers. Teachers with custodial attitudes tend to distrust students and to control their behavior through punitive sanctions. This paper presents findings of a study that replicated previous studies of the effect of school type and school level on teachers' perceptions of student control. A total of 405 teachers from 40 schools--20 public and 20 religious--completed the PCI. Contrary to previous research, the data found no significant difference between the pupil-control ideologies of religious school teachers and public school teachers. Data show that secondary school teachers were more custodial than primary school teachers; however, public school teachers were not found to be more custodial than religious school teachers. When both school level and type were considered together, an interactive effect was found: public school teachers at the primary level were the least custodial (most humanistic) and public school teachers at the secondary level were the most custodial. (Contains 49 references.) Two tables and one figure are included. (Author/LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 396 446

DISCIPLINE IN PUBLIC AND RELIGIOUS ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

by

Stephen J. Denig, Ed.D.
Saint John's University
Jamaica, New York

A Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of
the American Educational Research Association

New York, New York
April 8-12, 1996

EA 027 692

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
S Denig
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Previous studies using the Pupil-Control Ideology Scale (PCI) have found that in general secondary school teachers have a more custodial attitude toward pupil control than do primary school teachers, and that public school teachers have a more custodial attitude than do religious school teachers. The purposes of this study were (1) to replicate the previous studies on the effect of school type (public and religious) and school level (primary and secondary) on the perceptions of teachers regarding pupil control and (2) to find if there was an interaction of school type and school level. Over 400 teachers from 40 schools were surveyed. In this study secondary school teachers were found to be more custodial than primary school teachers, but public school teachers were not found to be more custodial than religious school teachers. When both level and type were considered together, an interactive effect was found--public schools teachers on the primary level were the least custodial, while public school teachers on the secondary level were the most custodial.

Discipline in school has been and remains a major concern for both teachers and the general public. For many teachers, "the task of overriding importance is gaining and maintaining the cooperation of students in activities that fill the daily class time" (Delaney & Sykes, 1988, pp. 16-17). Few teachers have the luxury of teaching one student at a time; they teach large group of students, and so they seek activities that will minimize noise and motion. After lack of proper financial support and drug abuse, discipline is the third biggest problem facing public schools in the perception of the general public. As recently as 1985, discipline was the public's greatest concern (Elam, Rose, & Gallup, 1993).

As early as 1932, Waller noted that a concern for discipline was related to the organizational structure of schools. He described schools as political organizations in which students are subordinate and teachers are dominant. Discipline is necessary to achieve an equilibrium between teachers and students. After conducting an extensive study of schools in the United States, Silberman (1970) concluded that the one characteristic that all public schools share is a "preoccupation with order and control" (p. 122). This concern for discipline is not the concern of public schools alone. Discipline has been found to be as important a factor as religion and academics for parents choosing to send their children to Catholic schools (Convey, 1992).

Conceptual Framework

Pupil Control Ideology: From Custodial to Humanistic

Teachers differ in their approach to classroom discipline. Some are more custodial, stressing impersonality, one-way communication, distrust of students, and a moralistic, punitive attitude; they are concerned with maintaining order in the classroom (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1967). Custodial teachers view the school as an autocratic organization, with a rigid hierarchy. They believe that punitive sanctions are necessary in order to control students, and any misbehavior is a personal affront (Rafalides & Hoy, 1971).

Others are more humanistic, in the sense that they have an accepting and trusting view of students, are concerned with the sociological and psychological bases of learning, and stress confidence in the ability of students to be self-disciplined and responsible (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1967). Humanistic teachers view the school as a community, in which students and teachers interact democratically (Rafalides & Hoy, 1971). The humanistic orientation is understood in the sense advocated by Erich Fromm--"an orientation which stresses the importance of the individuality of each student and a creation of an atmosphere to meet the wide range of student needs" (Hoy, 1969, p. 258). Humanism and custodialism are ideal types in the Weberian sense that they are pure types which are not necessarily found in the real world.

Pupil-control ideology is conceptualized as a continuum ranging from a humanistic orientation on the one end to a custodial orientation on the other. After a review of some of the relevant literature on pupil

control, the research instrument, methodology, and sample will be discussed. This will be followed by an analysis of the data and their implications.

Research on Pupil Control Ideology

The pupil-control ideology of a teacher is a reflection of the concern of the teacher for discipline in the school. In 1967, Willower, Eidell, and Hoy proposed that the pupil-control ideology of a teacher could be conceptualized as a continuum ranging from a low score of humanistic to a high score of custodial; they developed the Pupil-Control Ideology Scale as a measure of this ideology. Since its inception the scale has proven to be a very rich measure. Willower (1975) reviewed the considerable volume of literature dedicated to studies of pupil control ideology within the first decade of his publication; a study thirteen years later found over two hundred research articles based on this scale (Packard, 1988). These studies are often referred to as the Penn State Studies.

Student alienation has been found to be higher in schools where the teachers in general have a more custodial orientation (Rafilides & Hoy, 1971; Shearin, 1982). The self-actualization of students and the average pupil-control ideology of the faculty have been found to be inversely related (Deibert & Hoy, 1977); the less self-actualized the students were found to be, the more custodial was the ideology of the teacher.

Teachers who measure low on dogmatism, and thus are high in open-mindedness, have been found more humanistic than closed-minded teachers (Lunenburg & O'Reilly, 1974). Custodial teachers have been found to have more discipline referrals than humanistic teachers (Foley & Brooks, 1978). Humanistic teachers have a more positive self-concept

(Halpin, Halpin, & Harris, 1982). The expectancy motivation of humanistic teachers, operationalized in terms of expectancy, valence, and instrumentality, has been shown to be higher than that of custodial teachers (Kottkamp & Mulhern, 1987). A significant but weak correlation was found between the professional and humanistic orientations of the teachers (Willower & Landis, 1971). Teachers with a more custodial orientation experience greater occupational stress (Albertson & Kagan, 1987) and are more at risk of burnout than their more humanistic colleagues (Cadavid & Lunenburg, 1991).

Schools with an open organizational climate generally have teachers who are more humanistic (Appleberry & Hoy, 1969; Lunenburg & O'Reilly, 1974). Likewise, the more humanistic the teachers in the school, the higher the quality of school life, operationalized in terms of the students' satisfaction with school their commitment to classwork and their positive reactions to teachers (Lunenburg & Schmidt, 1988). The stronger the custodial orientation, the more stress that is placed on status obeisance, the value placed on authority for its own sake and the deference shown to people who are higher in rank (Helsel, 1971). Goal displacement also is more likely to occur in schools with a higher percentage of custodial teachers (Lunenburg, 1984).

In general, the pupil-control ideology of a teacher tends to be rather stable and consistent over time. One notable exception to this is the change in ideology that occurs in many neophyte teachers. Paschal and Treloar (1979) have demonstrated that prospective teachers become more humanistic during their undergraduate training and then more custodial during the first year of actual teaching experience. Hoy (1968) averred

that the reason for this is that teachers undergo a double socialization process. During college preparation for teaching the emphasis is on ideal practices and images. Student teachers are socialized into the more humanistic values and norms of the profession. The second phase of socialization occurs when the new teachers enter the classroom as a full-time employees and are socialized into the more custodial values and norms held by the other full-time members of the organization (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990). "Reality shock" is the term used by Veenman (1984) to describe the change the new teacher experiences upon entry into the harsh reality of the everyday classroom.

These studies have found that high school teachers tend to be more custodial than elementary. Brenneman, Willower, and Lynch (1975) found that elementary school teachers were on the average almost five points more humanistic on the PCI Scale than were secondary school teachers. Similarly, Estep, Willower, and Licata (1980) found that the greater custodialism of high school teachers was reflected in classrooms that were more orderly, more predictable, and less robust.

Other studies have found that religious school teachers are less custodial than those teachers in public school. For example, Lunenburg (1990) compared the attitude of Catholic school teachers with that of public school teachers and discovered that Catholic school teachers were more humanistic. However, no explanation for this phenomenon was proposed.

In this present study, the effect of school level (primary and secondary) and of school type (public and religious) were studied. The researcher sought to replicate the findings of previous studies--that secondary school teachers were more custodial than primary school

teachers, and that teachers in the public sector are more custodial than teachers in the religious sector. In addition, the interaction of school level and school type was explored.

Methodology

In order to examine the effects of school level and school type, data were collected from a sample population of public and parochial school teachers The instrument the Pupil-Control Ideology Scale, is discussed first, followed by a discussion of the sample and of the data collection procedures.

Pupil-Control Ideology Scale

In seeking to study the phenomenon of discipline in the schools, especially in the public schools, Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967) modified a scale developed by Gilbert and Levinson (1957). The Pupil-Control Ideology Scale (PCI) was conceptualized as a measure ranging from humanistic to custodial.

The PCI contains 20 items on a five-point Likert scale--strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, and strongly disagree; the higher the sum of the answers to the items the more custodial the respondent. Examples of items include the following: "A few pupils are just young hoodlums and should be treated accordingly," and "Pupils often misbehave in order to make the teacher look bad."

Split-halves reliability tests were conducted (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1967) on two samples yielding coefficients of .95 (N=170) and .91 (N=55). Halpin, Goldenberg, and Halpin (1974), in working with undergraduate education students, obtained a reliability coefficient of .86, which remained stable over a seven-day period. The validity of the

instrument was supported by the judgments of the principals of the respondents; those who had the more custodial scores were identified by their principals as being more custodial (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1967).

Sample

The sample for this study was drawn from 40 schools in two states of the Middle-Atlantic region of the United States. Twenty of the schools were public schools and 20 religious. Twenty of the schools were primary schools and 20 secondary. For the purpose of this study, middle schools were considered as primary schools and junior high schools as secondary. By design, therefore, in this study there were 10 religious primary schools, 10 religious secondary schools, 10 public primary schools, and 10 public secondary schools. This design allows for comparisons among the four types of schools. By intention, the schools in the sample were drawn from a mixture of urban, suburban, and rural schools.

In each of these 40 schools, responses were sought from between 10 and 12 teachers. On average, 10 teachers from each school responded to the questionnaire. In the final analysis there were 100 religious elementary teachers, 103 religious secondary teachers, 101 public primary teachers, and 101 public secondary teachers. In total, responses from 405 teachers were analyzed. Approximately 85% of the teachers returned usable questionnaires.

Data Collection Procedures

Data collection was done in one of two ways--either the researcher received permission from the principal to visit the school and collect the data; or the researcher trained a member of the faculty in data collection procedures and instructed the volunteer to contact the respondents and

collect the data from them. In the latter case, a script was used to insure consistency in collection procedures. The teachers responded to an instrument containing the operational measures of the study as well as several demographic questions. To avoid the possibility of the data being influenced by the authority of the principal, only a trained volunteer or a researcher distributed and collected the questionnaires, and confidentiality was assured to all respondents.

Discussion of Findings and Conclusions

Analysis of Data

The researcher analyzed the data collected using a variety of tests. First, the reliability coefficient of pupil-control ideology was determined. Then, the descriptive statistics, including the mean and standard deviation, were calculated. A t-test indicated the effect of gender on pupil-control ideology. Finally, through an analysis of variance the researcher studied the effect of type and level of school. The separate effects of school type and school level, as well as the interaction, were analyzed.

Reliability tests were conducted in order to determine the internal consistency of the measure, evaluating whether the twenty test items were homogeneous (Kerlinger, 1986). The alpha coefficient was determined to be .85, a strong measure of reliability.

The 20 responses comprising the pupil-control ideology scale were valued from 1 to 5 for "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." Two items (5 and 13) in this scale were reverse scored. The mean PCI for the present sample was 52.19, with a standard deviation of 10.47.

Data collected on the gender of the respondent allowed for exploratory analyses of the effect of gender on pupil-control ideology.

Confirming the findings of previous studies, females were more humanistic in their ideology than were males ($X_{male} = 55.51$; $X_{female} = 51.18$; $p<.01$). The results of the t-test are summarized in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 Here

The final analysis explored the differences in pupil-control ideology of teachers from two types of schools (religious and public) and two levels (primary and secondary). To what extent do the type and the level influence pupil control ideology? To answer the query, a factorial analysis of variance was performed with type and level of school as the independent variables.

The level of school was found to have a significant independent effect on pupil-control ideology; this replicates the findings of previous studies. Primary teachers were more humanistic in their pupil-control ideology than were their counterparts in secondary schools ($X_{prim}=49.80$; $X_{secon}=54.53$; $p<.01$). Contrary to the findings of previous studies, no significant independent effect was found for school type. However, the interaction of these two independent variables was found to have a significant effect on ideology. Religious primary school teachers were more custodial than their counterparts in public primary schools ($X_{RelPrim}=51.76$; $X_{PublPrim}=47.89$; $p<.01$); but public secondary schools teachers were more custodial than their colleagues in religious secondary schools ($X_{RelSec}=52.23$; $X_{PublSec}=56.88$; $p<.01$). The analysis of variance data are summarized in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 Here

The Effect of School Level

Primary school teachers were found to be more humanistic in their pupil-control ideology than were secondary school teachers. Jones (1982) speculated that the reason for this may be that elementary school teachers meet fewer students in the course of the normal day and get to know those students and their needs better. Also, there is less stress in the elementary school to finish a complete lesson before the bell rings at the end of the period. Another explanation was offered by Willower and Lawrence (1979). In many schools, students are perceived as threats and, therefore, control is a concern of the faculty. The larger physical size, the greater maturity, and the more advanced age of secondary students make them a greater perceived threat than are elementary students. Another explanation of the phenomenon may be that males have been found to be more custodial than females (Brenneman, Willower, & Lynch, 1975; Harris, Halpin, & Halpin, 1985), and a higher percentage of male teachers are secondary teachers. In this sample male teachers were found to be more custodial than females (Table 1). In addition, males comprise are only 6% of the primary school teachers in this sample but comprise 43% of the secondary school teachers. There is, thus, a greater concentration of custodial males in the secondary schools. The more liberal and child-centered philosophy of elementary school teachers (Gibson, 1970) may also be reflected in their more humanistic ideology. Packard (1988)

speculated that secondary schools may attract or may select teachers who lean toward a custodial orientation. Similarly, weak control by a teacher is perceived by one's peers in high schools as an indication of ineffectiveness (Willower & Lawrence, 1979). Thus, it comes as no surprise that elementary teachers were more humanistic in their pupil-control ideologies.

The Effect of School Type

Carlson (1964) studied service organizations by creating a typology based on two criteria--organizational control over the admission of clients and client control over participation in the organization. See Figure 1 for a representation of Carlson's typology.

Insert Figure 1 Here

Most service organizations are Type I Service Organizations, where the organization exercises control over who is admitted and the client chooses to participate in the organization. Because participation is voluntary on the part of both the organization and the client, this researcher has called these organizations "Voluntary Organizations." Even though in some cases the student may not choose to attend the school, both the parents' choice of the school and the school's ability to select students fulfill the criteria for religious schools to be considered as Voluntary Organizations. In the second type of service organizations, which this researcher has called "Choice Organizations," the client chooses to participate, but the organization has limited control over

admissions; for example, the state university that must admit all qualified residents of the state. The third type of service organization ("Selective Organizations"), where the client has no choice over participation but the organization does control admissions, Carlson considered to be virtually non-existent; he gave no example of this type. Finally, some organizations are what Carlson called "Domesticated Organizations," where neither the client has a choice concerning participation nor does the organization exercise control over admissions. This fourth type is exemplified by state mental hospitals, reform schools, prisons, and public schools

The inclusion of public schools with the other three examples may seem strange, but it does help to highlight the concern for discipline in the public schools. These schools ordinarily are not free to exclude students who are problematic. Students who do not wish to participate in school are still legally bound to attend school until they reach a certain age. Thus, like state mental hospitals, reform schools, and prisons, public schools must accept those whom the state sends to them, and the client must attend.

In these Domesticated Organizations, there is no need to engage in competition with one another. These organizations "are fed and cared for" (p. 266) by a steady flow of clients required by law to attend. Because these organizations cannot select clients, they engage in segregation; that is, they cluster unresponsive or troublesome clients into special groups. This practice often leads to goal displacement, where the emphasis is no longer placed on the stated aims of the organization. Emphasis is placed instead on discipline and the maintenance of order.

Religious schools, which students (or their parents) are free to select and which have the corresponding ability to select among those students who apply, are Voluntary Organizations. Theoretically, control of students should be a lesser concern in religious schools than in public schools. Surprisingly, this was not the case; there was no significant difference between the pupil-control ideology of public school teachers and that of religious school teachers, when the effect of school level is not considered. Indeed, in the perceptions of many people, there is a greater concern for discipline in private schools, including religious schools, than in public schools (Jones-Wilson, 1992).

The reason that religious schools are perceived to have a greater concern for discipline may be that there are custodial influences in the culture of these schools that are absent in public schools. First, behavior is viewed in moralistic terms. The evangelical mission of religious schools influences teachers to view behavior in moralistic terms and to recast issues within a moral framework (O'Brien, 1985). Second, many religious schools have a middle-class mentality. Bryk, Lee, and Holland (1993) describe Catholic schools (the majority of religious schools in this sample are Catholic schools) as "bridging the gap," providing a passage way that enables the poor to enter the middle class. Part of the mission of the Catholic school is to welcome all who come to it and prepare them to enter the contemporary American middle class. Thomas (1990) described the middle-class expectations of teachers for schools as "happy, orderly, well-dressed children compliant with adult authority" (p. 268). Order and compliance are characteristic of a custodial mentality. Finally, in religious schools, where families worship in the same church,

there is a greater sense of community. This greater sense of community creates a common sense of values and controls deviant behavior (Coleman, 1987); there is stronger agreement on how students should behave (Bryk & Driscoll, 1988). While the ideology of teachers in public schools might be influenced by the custodial tendencies of Type IV organizations, the ideology of religious school teachers may be similarly affected by the evangelistic mission, middle-class mentality, and the community culture of the religious schools in this sample.

Effect of the Interaction of School Level and Type

The interaction of school level and school type was significant. In the primary grades public school teachers were more humanistic than religious school teachers. In secondary schools, however, teachers in the religious sector were more humanistic than those in the public sector. While there was a significant difference between the ideologies of public primary and secondary school teachers, no significant difference was found between the ideologies of primary and secondary school teachers in the religious schools.

The effect caused by the interaction of school type and level may be explained by the difference in strength of the custodial effects on the two levels. In public primary schools, where the younger age, smaller size, and relative immaturity of the children make them less a threat to the teachers (Willower, 1975), the influence of the custodial tendency found in Domesticated Organizations is weaker. Correspondingly, in public secondary schools, the custodial effect is stronger.

In addition, the function of institutionalized structures (e.g., discipline and dress codes) in religious schools should be considered.

These institutionalized structures are stronger in religious secondary schools than there are in public schools (Erickson, 1994). These codes are not only written, but especially in Catholic schools (DiPrete, 1981; Yeager, Benson, Guerra, & Manno, 1985) are communicated and enforced. As a result, the students in Catholic schools, as well as in other religious schools, are more well-behaved than students in public schools (DiPrete, 1981). Durkheim (1961) argued that the goal of a strong discipline code was to inculcate self-discipline and self-control in the child. In primary grades teachers in religious schools may have to exercise more external control in order to inculcate those values. Enforcement of these institutional structures may be a factor in explaining why religious primary school teachers were found to be more custodial in ideology than those in public primary schools. In religious secondary schools, however, the teachers have only to reinforce that control, because the assumption is that the students have learned to be self-disciplined. This expectation that students can be self-disciplined is characteristic of a humanistic ideology (Hoy, 1969).

Two factors, thus, interact inversely--the custodial effect of Domesticated Organizations and the custodial effect of imposing institutional structures. In public primary school the lesser size, age, and maturity of the students weakens the custodial effect of Domesticated Organization, whereas in religious primary schools the custodial effect of the dress and discipline codes is strengthened. These effects are reversed in secondary schools. In the public sector, the greater size, age, and maturity of the students enhances the custodial effect of Domesticated Organizations. Religious secondary schools may find that the rules,

regulations, and norms reinforce student self-control and the students are less a threat to the teacher than they are in the public school.

Summary and Implications

Conclusions

Over four hundred teachers from 40 schools were studied. The pupil-control ideology of these teachers were compared. Consistent with previous studies, the primary school teachers in general were found to be more humanistic than those in secondary schools. Contrary to previous studies, however, no significant difference was found when the ideology of religious school teachers was compared to the ideology of public school teachers. What is surprising is the significant interaction between school type and school level. The most humanistic teachers were those in public primary schools, while the most custodial were those in public secondary schools.

Implications

Further study is necessary to assess whether the interactive effect found in this study can be replicated in other studies. Are primary school teachers in the public sector more humanistic than their colleagues in the religious sector? Are secondary school teachers in public schools more custodial than those in religious schools?

Second, are Bryk, Lee, and Holland (1993) correct when they characterize the mentality of Catholic schools as more middle-class than that of public schools? If so, would increasing the percentage of middle-class (e.g., suburban) public schools in the sample increase the custodial ideology of public school teachers in general? Would increasing the

percentage of inner-city Catholic schools decrease the middle-class mentality found in those schools?

Third, are all religious schools characterized by a middle-class mentality? Would the influence of the middle-class custodial tendency be reduced or strengthened by increasing the percentage of non-Catholic schools (e.g., Christian fundamentalist schools, Jewish schools) in the sample?

Fourth, if more inner-city high schools were included in the religious secondary school sample, would the effect of threat influence the teachers to be more custodial than the teachers in this sample were found to be?

Researchers (Bryk, Lee, & Holland, 1993) have noted that one of the strengths of the Catholic school is the consensus among the various members in the school community (administrators, teachers, parents, etc.) about the goals of the school. This may be reflected in the finding that there is no significant difference between the ideology of teachers in primary and secondary religious schools. Consensus about the institutional structures of dress and discipline codes is a strength upon which religious schools can build. Public school administrators, on the other hand, should note that there is a significant difference between the ideology of their primary school teachers and that of their secondary school teachers. This may be a result of a lack of consensus about the institutional structures. Perhaps the threat posed by many secondary school students could be lessened, if greater self-discipline were to be expected of them as a result of a stronger discipline being imposed on them in primary school.

REFERENCES

Albertson, L. M., & Kagan, D. M. (1987). Occupational stress among teachers. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 21(1), 69-75.

Appleberry, J. B., & Hoy, W. K. (1969). The pupil-control ideology of professional personnel in "open" and "closed" elementary schools. Educational Administration Quarterly, 5(3), 74-85.

Brenneman, O. N., Willower, D. J., & Lynch, P. D. (1975). Teacher self-acceptance, acceptance of others, and pupil-control ideology. Journal of Experimental Education, 44(1), 14-17.

Bryk, A. S., & Driscoll, M. E. (1988). The high school as community: Contextual influences, and consequences for students and teachers. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Center for Education Research (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 302 539)

Bryk, A. S., Lee, V. E., & Holland, P. (1993). Catholic schools and the common good. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cadavid, V., & Lunenburg, F. C.. (1991). Locus of control, pupil-control ideology, and dimensions of teacher burnout. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 333 560)

Carlson, R. O. (1964). Environmental constraints and organizational consequences: The public school and its clients. In D. Griffiths (Ed.), Behavioral science and educational administration (pp. 262-276). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Coleman, J. S. (1987). Public and private high schools: The impact of communities. New York: Basic Books.

Convey, J. J. (1992). Catholic schools make a difference: Twenty-five years of research. Washington, DC: National Catholic Educational Association.

Deibert, J., & Hoy, W. (1977). Custodial high schools and self-actualization of students. Educational Research Quarterly, 2(2), 24-31.

Delaney, K., & Sykes, G. (1988). Making the case for professionalism. In A. Liebman (Ed.), Building a professional structure in schools, (pp. 3 - 22). New York: Teachers College Press.

DiPrete, T. A. (1981). Discipline and order in American high schools. Contractor report. Chicago, IL: National Opinion Research Center (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 224 137).

Durkheim, E. (1961). Moral education: A study in the theory and application of the sociology of education (trans. E. K. Wilson and h. Schnurer), New York: The Free Press.

Elam, S. M., Rose, L. C., & Gallup, A. M. (1993). The 25th annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 75(2), 137-152.

Erickson, D. A. (1994). Insight and confusion in a private school study. Private School Monitor, 15(4), 1-21.

Estep, L. E., Willower, D. J., & Licata, J. W. (1980). Teacher pupil-control ideology and behavior as predictors of classroom robustness. High School Journal, 63(4), 155-159.

Foley, W. J., & Brooks, R. (1978). Pupil-control ideology in predicting teacher discipline referrals. Educational Administration Quarterly, 14(3), 104-112.

Gibson, D. R. (1970). The role of the primary and secondary school teacher. Educational Research, 13(1), 20-27.

Gilbert, D. C., & Levinson, D. J. (1957). "Custodialism" and "humanism" in mental hospital structure and in staff ideology. In M. Greenblatt, D. J. Levinson. and R. H. Williams (Eds.), The patient and the mental hospital, (pp. 20-35). Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Halpin, G, Goldenberg, R., & Halpin, G. (1974). Are creative teachers more humanistic in their pupil-control ideologies? Journal of Creative Behavior, 7(4), 282-286.

Halpin, G., Halpin, G., & Harris, K. (1982). Personality characteristics and self-concept of preservice teachers related to their pupil-control orientation. Journal of Experimental Education, 50(1), 195-199.

Harris, K. R., Halpin, G., & Halpin, G. (1985). Teacher characteristics and stress. Journal of Educational Research, 78(6), 346-50.

Helsel, A. R. (1971). Status obeisance and pupil-control ideology. Journal of Educational Administration, 9(1), 38-47.

Hoy, W. K. (1968). The influence of experience on the beginning teacher. School Review, 76(3), 312-323.

Hoy, W. K. (1969). pupil-control ideology and organizational socialization: A further examination of the influence of experience on the beginning teacher. School Review, 77 (3-4), 257-265.

Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk, A. (1990). Socialization of student teachers. American Education Research Journal, 27(2), 279-300.

Jones, D. R. (1982). Influence of the length and level of student teaching on pupil-control ideology. High School Journal, 65(7), 220-225.

Jones-Wilson, F. (1992). Why not public schools? Journal of Negro Education, 61(2), 125-137.

Kerlinger, F. N. (1986). Foundations of behavioral research 3rd ed. Philadelphia: Holt, Rienhart and Winston, Inc.

Kottamp, R. B., & Mulhern, J. A. (1987). Teacher expectancy motivation, open to closed climate and pupil-control ideology in high schools. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 20(2), 9-18.

Lunenburg, F. C. (1984). "Custodial" teachers: Negative effects on schools. Clearing House, 58(3), 112-116.

Lunenburg, F. C. (1986). Disipline and learning in Chicago schools. Chicago: Loyola University of Chicago.

Lunenburg, F. C. (1990). Teacher pupil-control ideology and behavior as predictors of classroom environment: Public and Catholic schools compared. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Reearch Association, Boston, MA (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 322 115)

Lunenburg, F. C., & O'Reilly, R. R. (1974). Personal and organizational influence on pupil-control ideology. Journal of Experimental Education, 42(3), 31-35.

Lunenburg, F. C., & Schmidt, L.J. (1988). Pupil-control ideology and the quality of school life. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 294 938)

O'Brien, T. F. (1985). Counseling and religion: How they mix in a parochial school setting. Paper presented at the Annual convention of the American Association for Counseling and Development, New York, NY (ERIC Document Reporduction Service No. ED 275 983)

Packard, J. S. (1988). The pupil-control studies. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Educational Administration (pp. 185-207). New York: Longman.

Paschal, B. J., & Treloar, J. H. (1979). A longitudinal study of attitude change in prospective and beginning elementay school teachers . The Teacher Educator, 15(1), 2-9.

Rafilides, M., & Hoy, W. K. (1971). Student sense of alienation and pupil-control orientation of high schools. High School Journal, 55(3), 101-111.

Shearin, W. H., Jr. (1982). The relationship between student alienation and extent of faculty agreement on pupil-control ideology. High School Journal, 66(1), 32-35.

Silberman, C. (1970). Crisis in the classroom. New York, NY: Random House.

Thomas, B. R. (1990). The school as a moral learning community. In J. I. Goodlad, R. Soder, & K. A. Sirotnik (Eds.), The moral dimensions of teaching (pp. 266-295). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. Review of Educational Research, 54(2), 143-178.

Waller, W. (1932). The sociology of teaching. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Willower, D. J. (1975). Some comments on inquiries on school and student control. Teachers College Record, 77(2), 219-230.

Willower, D. J., Eidell, T. L., and Hoy, W. K. (1967). The school and pupil-control ideology. (Pennsylvania State Studies Mongraph No. 24). University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Willower, D. J., & Landis, C. A. (1971). Pupil-control ideology and professional orientation of school faculty. Journal of Secondary Education, 45(3), 118-123.

Willower, D. J., & Lawrence, J. D. (1979). Teachers' perception of student threat to teacher status and teacher pupil-control ideology. Psychology in the Schools, 16(4), 586-590.

Yeager, R. J., Benson, B. L., Guerra, M. J., & Manno, B. V. (1985). The Catholic high school: A national portrait. Washington, DC: National Catholic Educational Association.

Table 1

T-test on the effect of gender

Variable	Gender	n	Mean	Stan Dev	t Value	df	2-tail Prob
Pupil-Control Ideology	Male	99	55.51	10.20	3.60	395	.000
	Female	298	51.18	10.39			

Table 2

Summary Data and Analysis of Variance for Pupil-Control Ideology

	Religious Primary	Religious Secondary	Public Primary	Public Secondary
n:	99	103	101	101
M:	51.76	52.23	47.89	56.88
SD:	8.72	10.18	8.68	12.09

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F
Total	44210.94	403		
Between Levels	2262.66	1	2262.66	22.57**
Between Types	18.94	1	18.94	.19
Interaction	1830.25	1	1830.25	18.26**
Residual	40102.97	400	100.26	

**p<.01

Figure 1

	Organizational Control:	Yes	No
Client Control	Yes	I: Voluntary	III: Choice
	No	II: Selective	IV: Domesticated